

From: [PETERSON Jenn L](#)
To: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Subject: RE: summary of today's call
Date: 08/23/2006 10:28 AM

Thanks Eric-

I had not seen the proposal to use a site wide summation approach for determining summing methodology for exposure point concentrations for all receptors in the eco risk assessment. While this is conservative (if detected anywhere I am assuming it will be included in the sum at 1/2 the detection limit for all exposure point concentrations), it likely will not relate changes throughout the harbor in contaminant distribution and composition to changes in risk estimates (where appropriate; e.g. sculpin, crayfish, smallmouth bass, clam). It sounds like human health is going forward with area specific summations, so it is unclear why this cannot occur for the ecological risk assessment as well. Doing it this way avoids tackling the spatial scale issue, which may be the driving factor for not including it (we will have to do this sooner or later!). I would prefer to have more realistic risk estimates and sums for bioaccumulatives to feed the models.

The rest of the descriptions here only relate to the food web model and not the ecological risk assessment. For example, no mention is made on any agreements on how to calculate exposure point concentrations for fish (dietary approach), the dietary matrix for this evaluation or how the diet will be represented in the calculations (we were asking for a probabilistic approach here).

-Jennifer

-----Original Message-----

From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 22, 2006 2:51 PM
To: PETERSON Jenn L
Subject: Fw: summary of today's call

Jennifer, here is the email. Thanks for the feedback. I will digest and incorporate into the issue summary table as necessary.

Eric

----- Forwarded by Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US on 08/22/2006 02:17 PM -----

John Toll
<johnt@windwardenv.com>

07/06/2006 06:08 PM

Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA	To
	cc
Lisa Saban	
<lisas@windwardenv.com>, Nancy	
Judd <nancyj@windwardenv.com>	
	Subject
summary of today's call	

Hi Eric. Here's a brief summary of the status of the issues discussed on today's call. At this point I do not believe that there are any FWM issues that should affect our ability to meet the Round 2 report schedule.

1. Summation Rules - I quickly summarized what Susie McGroddy and Laure Kennedy worked out this morning regarding summation rules. Here's a briefing from Susie:
"For sediments, both Eco and Human health will include all components of the sum that are detected in at least one sample on a site-wide basis. All sediment total PCB values will be the same in both risk assessments. For water the same approach will be used for both assessments."
"For tissues, Eco will review site-wide data and determine a summation based on any component detected in one tissue sample on a site-wide basis. Human health will do the same for their site-wide assessments. Human health exposure area assessments may have different sums because they will determine area-specific summations based on the components detected within the area. (Eco) will use our site-wide summation for all exposure areas."
2. Dietary Composition and Range of Input Parameters - I think that this issue is generally resolved. We agreed to put ranges on some model parameter estimates (average water temperature, average body weights, average lipid contents, Kows and average sediment and water concentrations) and run Monte Carlo simulations, but we will only do sensitivity analysis and not put probability distributions on model outputs. We agreed to send Bruce a table of parameter ranges when it's ready for quick review (~one-day turnaround).

- This could become a schedule issue if the parameter ranges become a point of dispute but I don't expect that to happen.
3. Spatial Scale - I think that this issue is generally resolved. We will be calibrating the model site-wide. We'll produce Thiessen polygon maps that are color-coded to show exceedances of initial PRGs, but AOPCs will be based on exposure area-averaged sediment concentrations. The specific foraging range assumption for the smallmouth bass still has to be worked out. We talked about using a range of ~0.33-1 mile. We also agreed to look at whether it's feasible to automate SWAC calculations for bass home ranges that are on one side of the channel or the other, and if so to do it.
 4. Chemical List - I think that this issue is generally resolved. We agreed to the June 6th chemical list (PCBs, DDx's and dioxins/furans) with the qualification that we will run the calibrated model for chlordane as time permits, to see how well it works. If the chlordane model is over-predicting empirical fish tissue concentrations we'll try adjusting the metabolism rate coefficient within reasonable bounds as based on the scientific literature (Bruce already sent us citations to a few papers on chlordane metabolism after our call) to see whether that improves the fit. As planned we will attempt to develop BSAF's for everything except PCBs, DDx's and dioxins/furans. If the chlordane FWM gets done and is working we'll use it, otherwise we'll use the BSAF.

John

John Toll, Ph.D.
Associate
Windward Environmental LLC
200 West Mercer Street, Suite 401
Seattle, WA 98119-3958
(206) 812-5433
www.windwardenv.com, www.tollenvironmental.com